

CANDACE McLAREN LANHAM
Chief Deputy Attorney General



CAROLYN A. QUATTROCKI
Deputy Attorney General

LEONARD J. HOWIE III
Deputy Attorney General

ZENITA WICKHAM HURLEY
Chief, Equity, Policy, and Engagement

(410) 576-7648

JULIA DOYLE
Division Chief

PETER V. BERNS
General Counsel

CHRISTIAN E. BARRERA
Chief Operating Officer

RYAN R. DIETRICH
Assistant Attorney General

STATE OF MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
CIVIL DIVISION

ANTHONY G. BROWN
Attorney General

rdietrich@oag.state.md.us

July 16, 2024

Via CM/ECF

Nwamaka Anowi, Clerk
 U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
 1100 East Main Street, Suite 501
 Richmond, Virginia 23219

Re: *Maryland Shall Issue, Inc. v. Moore*, No. 21-2017

Dear Ms. Anowi:

Defendants hereby respond to plaintiffs' letter (Doc. 101) advising this Court of the summary disposition of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Antonyuk v. James*, No. 23-910, 2024 WL 3259671 (July 2, 2024). The Supreme Court granted the petition for writ of certiorari, vacated the judgment in *Antonyuk v. Chiumento*, 89 F.4th 271 (2d Cir. 2023), and remanded the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for further consideration in light of the Court's decision in *United States v. Rahimi*, 144 S. Ct. 1889 (2024).

In *Rahimi*, the Supreme Court had "no trouble" concluding that 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8) survived a facial constitutional challenge under the Second Amendment. *Id.* at 1902. In doing so, the Court clarified that the core question at the second step of *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1 (2022), is not whether a modern regulation is supported by "a 'dead ringer' or a 'historical twin,'" but whether a "challenged regulation is consistent with the *principles* that underpin our regulatory tradition." *Id.* at 1898 (emphasis added).

In *Antonyuk*, the Second Circuit addressed a challenge to a litany of New York's firearms laws, including those relating to licensing requirements for public-carry permits and restrictions on the public carrying of firearms at sensitive places. Applying the *Bruen* standard, the Second Circuit upheld some of New York's laws while striking down others as unconstitutional.

Although the Supreme Court's order has in fact vacated the judgment in *Antonyuk*, the order, which was summary in nature, does nothing to undermine the Second Circuit's underlying reasoning. Indeed, the overarching message of *Rahimi* was to provide guidance to those courts that had applied *Bruen*'s test too narrowly to strike down "common sense" legislation.

Nor does the Court's order have any direct impact on this case. Although the State did rely on *Antonyuk* to support its position, the principles that the Second Circuit applied, and that the State advanced in its briefing, were all derived from *Bruen*. Plaintiffs' attempt to use the order to support their arguments thus misses the mark.

Sincerely,

/s/Ryan R. Dietrich

Ryan R. Dietrich

Cc: All counsel through CM/ECF